REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8-10 were pending with Claims 1, 6, and 10 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 9 have been amended without adding new matter. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8, 9 and 11 are pending with Claims 1, 6 and 11 being independent claims and the remaining claims being dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 and consideration of Claim 11 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant has canceled Claim 10 without prejudice or disclaimer and reserves the right to present it at a later time. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 10 is now moot and is not discussed further herein. Moreover, Applicant has added Claim 11 without adding new matter and is believed to be allowable because it is directed to that which is not shown or suggested in the prior art.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsueda (U.S. App. No. 2002/0186400) in view of Mansfield (U.S. Pat. 5,014,192).

In regard to Independent Claim 1, the Office Action has not provided a
prior art reference or references that teach or suggest all of the features recited
in the pending claim.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a printing apparatus that processes a
print job and includes: "a receiving unit configured to receive, from an information
processing system, the print job and a notification destination of information
indicating completion of cancellation of the print job". . . "and a transmitting unit
configured to transmit the information indicating that the received print job has
been canceled to the notification destination received by the receiving unit, after
the print job has been canceled in accordance with the request received by the
request receiving unit, wherein the notification destination received by the
receiving unit is different from the information processing system to which the
responding unit transmits the response information or the error information"
(emphasis added).

Thus, it is possible to transmit information indicating that the print job has
been canceled to a notification destination which is different from the information
processing system which has transmitted a request for canceling the print job.
Moreover, a user is able to receive the information indicating that the print job
has been canceled at a notification destination which is different from the
information processing system which has transmitted a request, and to check the
information (emphasis added).

Reviewing Matsueda, it discloses that in a case where the server printing
system 12-2 receives a job cancellation request from the client printing system

12-1, the server printing system 12-2 determines whether a status of a job to be

canceled by the received job cancellation request is "being entered" or "already

entered" (Paragraph 81). Furthermore, Matsueda discloses that in a case where

the status of the job is "already entered", the server printing system 12-2 issues a

job cancel command to the printer 231 (Paragraph 81). Moreover, Matsueda

discloses that in response to reception of a job deletion event from the printer

231, the server printing system 12-2 changes a status of a management table to

"deleted" in accordance with the received job deletion event (Paragraph 29).

However, the server printing system 12-2 of Matsueda does not receive a

notification destination of information indicating completion of cancellation of a

print job, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, the server printing system 12-2 is not

for transmitting information indicating completion of cancellation of a job to a

notification destination which is different from the information processing system

to which response information indicating that a cancel request has been received

is transmitted. This is because the server printing system 12-2 of Matsueda is for

notifying, without exception, the client printing system 12-1 that a job status has

been changed based on the job deletion event (Paragraph 53). More

specifically, the server printing system 12-2 does not transmit information

indicating a status of a job to a notification destination which is different from the

client printing system 12-1, as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, the printer 231 of

Matsueda cancels a job in a case where a cancel command of the job is received

from the server printing system 12-2 and, after the cancellation of the job is

completed, the printer 231 transmits a job cancel event to the server printing

system 12-2. However, the printer 231 is also for transmitting, without exception, the job cancel event to the server printing system 12-2. That is, the printer 231 does not transmit the job cancel event to a notification destination which is different from the server printing system 12-2, as recited in Claim 1.

Reviewing Mansfield, it describes a file system in which a message "File not found" is transmitted to the next file system in a case where a file specified by a file name cannot be found. However, Mansfield is for transmitting the message to the predetermined next file system. Thus, the file system of Mansfield does not receive a notification destination of information indicating completion of cancellation of a print job. Therefore, information indicating completion of cancellation of a job is not transmitted to a notification destination which is different from the information processing system to which response information indicating that a cancel request has been received is transmitted, as recited in Claim 1.

Because Matsueda and Mansfield lack at least the above-noted features of Claim 1, Matsueda and Mansfield, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claims 6 is directed to a method of canceling a print job and a storage medium for storing computer-executable process steps for canceling a print job and was rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such,

the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 6 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims (Claims 2-5 and 8-9) are dependent claims and depend from one of allowable Claims 1 or 6. Therefore, the dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3104.

Respectfully submitted,

   12/11/2009   /Jonathan Ibasco/

Date   Jonathan Ibasco, Reg. No. 63,628
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560